New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements

Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 2, 1917

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York Corporation. Ogden Reid, President; G. Vernor Rogers, Vice-President; Richard H. Waldo, Secretary; F. A. Suter, Treasurer. Address, Tribune Building, 154 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone, Beekman 3000.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York:

Daily and Sunday, 1 mo.	$ .75	Daily only, 1 month	$ .50
Daily and Sunday, 6 mos	4.25	Daily only, 6 months	3.00
Daily and Sunday, 1 year	8.50	Daily only, 1 year	6.00
Sunday only, 6 months	1.25	Sunday only 1 year	2.50

FOREIGN RATES.		CANADIAN RATES.	
DAILY AND SUNDAY.		DAILY AND SUNDAY.	
One month	$1.84	One month	$ .75
One year	22.05	One year	8.50
SUNDAY ONLY.		DAILY ONLY.	
Six months	3.33	One month	.50
One year	6.66	One year	6.00
DAILY ONLY.		SUNDAY ONLY.	
One month	1.29	One month	.50
One year	15.39	One year	4.58

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

The New Offensive

Accepting the statements made by the correspondents on the spot and in London that the latest operation in Flanders is the opening phase of the British offensive for 1917—and the French part is relatively small—we are seeing the start of what may prove the decisive contest of the war. Such evidence as has come to hand points to another Somme campaign, a campaign of steady, sustained pressure, marked also by recurring general attacks after long and intensive artillery preparation.

And at the outset of such a campaign it is well to recognize certain essential facts. The immediate purpose of the offensive is not to seize control of the Belgian seacoast, turn the German flank in Belgium, or pierce the German line as a whole. These are remote and ultimate possibilities, but the immediate purpose is to renew the grinding of last year and the consequent exhaustion of German reserves and lowering of German morale. We shall fall into the German trap if we accept at once extreme and hardly attainable objectives and then judge the success or failure of an opening move as it attains or fails to reach ends which can be attained only by long effort and at the close of an extensive campaign.

Beyond all else, the new attack must be designed to inflict upon the Germans losses beyond their resources in reserves to make good. We know, on German testimony, that the Allies outnumber the Germans probably 2 to 1 on the Western front. We know that they outgun and outmunition them. Now, it is axiomatic in the present war that the army with the superior artillery inflicts the greater loss, given anything like equality in efficiency of handling—and the British have demonstrated their efficiency. The question of attack or defence is unimportant by comparison, as many battles have demonstrated.

Possessing vastly superior reserves of munitions and parks of artillery and again asserting something approaching the mastery of the air, the British are likely to inflict upon the Germans heavier losses than they incur. This means a more rapid exhaustion of the German reserves, already far inferior to the British.

Now, this situation long protracted may lead to a collapse at some point on the German front; it may lead to a German retirement in advance of such a collapse. Conceivably, there may be an immediate collapse, but this is merely remotely possible and is excessively unlikely.

What we may expect is a gradual eating into the German front between the Lys and the sea, comparable to the slow grinding through at the Somme last year. We should see more rapid progress because the British have a trained army now, where they had green troops a year ago, and the German morale in the West has visibly lowered during a year of defeat and retreat.

At the Somme the Germans lost 85,000 prisoners and several hundred guns and suffered over half a million casualties. They were ultimately compelled to retreat upwards of twenty miles on a wide front, evacuating a thousand square miles of French territory. Actually the fight lasted from July 1 to November 1, but bad weather in October handicapped the British just at the moment when things were going best.

Unless the British are again handicapped by bad weather they have now three months of fighting season ahead of them. Granted that they make progress as they did last year, it is clear that by the coming of winter the whole German position between the Lys and the sea will be untenable and the German hold upon the French cities of Lille, Roubaix, Tourcoing will be shaken.

A successful advance for a distance equal to that from Roye to St. Quentin would mean that the Germans would be compelled to draw out of the whole region of the Belgian coast, evacuate Zeebrügge, which is a valuable submarine base, and an even more important base for aeroplane raids over Britain.

If the pressure is steady and the resistance constant—that is, if there is no piercing of the German line—the Germans may be able to take a new position either behind the Lys or the Scheldt and maintain the rest of their front in France. If the British force the crossings of the Lys at Menin and Courtrai then the Germans will probably have to retire from Lille, Roubaix, Tourcoing, and this might involve an eventual retreat to the French frontier and a stand on the line of the Meuse and the Scheldt from Verdun to Antwerp, covering Brussels.

But all these possibilities are now remote. Unless all signs fail we are to see one more bitter, gruelling contest of the Somme sort. Gains of a mile or two are unlikely after the first few days, except after long preparation. An actual piercing of the German front is the remotest of all possibilities. Yet it is exactly this possibility which will be seized upon by the Germans as the test of Allied success or failure.

The test of Allied success or failure will be the comparative casualty lists of the two forces, the ultimate condition of the two armies when the struggle ends because of weather conditions, and the amount of ground conquered will be of only secondary importance. Recall that Grant broke the back of the Confederacy in his campaign from the Rapidan to the James in 1864 without winning a decisive victory or attaining one of his immediate objectives. His campaign led to ultimate success because the South could not replace casualties and he could.

It is well to bear in mind that the British attack may be shifted to the La Bassée sector—it may be transferred south of Lens or it may continue on the present front. The initiative now remains permanently with the British. And the explanation of the German attacks upon the Chemin-des-Dames is plainly to be found in the presence of French troops in Flanders. Clearly the Germans, aware of this transfer, sought to prevent it by pressure exerted along the Aisne. And it is clear that their costly efforts were a failure.

We are probably at the beginning of the greatest campaign of the war. To announce that the British objectives are Lille, Tournai and Ostend, to proclaim that the British are striving to cut off the Germans from the seacoast or penetrate the German front, is to make the maximum of ultimate possibility the test of immediate success. And we shall find the Germans doing this at once and doubtless persuading the thoughtless that the offensive has failed because it has not ended in a colossal immediate success.

But it is well to recall that no such immediate results are expected. The cost in men is a better measure of the real success, and the condition of the two armies next November and the reserves of the two nations then will be the real tests of success or failure.

The British attack will hardly have an immediate effect in the East, because few German troops are operating there, and Russian disintegration, not German battle triumph, explains that situation. Unless all signs fail there will shortly be a new Italian offensive, which will distract Austrian attention and tend to help the Russians, if, indeed, it be possible to help them.

As to the immediate gains of the British and French and their significance, the reports are still too fragmentary to draw any valuable conclusion. At the end of the first day's fighting the French and British had nearly, but not completely, regained the ground lost in April, 1915, at the time of the "poison gas" attacks; but the British had not yet regained the ground lost in October, 1915, due eastward of Ypres in the direction of Menin.

The statement of Sir Douglas Haig that all the objectives of the first attack were attained is borne out by the pause following the offensive. This contrasts with the desperate fighting for days in the Champagne offensive in 1915, and even in the case of Vimy Ridge, where it took sustained and repeated efforts to complete the clearing of the German positions. Now we have rather the tactics of Pétain's two Verdun operations and Haig's recent attack on the Messines Ridge. It is conceivable that several days or weeks may pass before a new advance is undertaken.

But the explanation of the third Ypres operation is now patent. By taking the Messines Ridge the British "put out" the German eyes, took all the observation posts and not only shut out German observation but also gained a sweep of all the country from the Ypres salient to Lille. It was then, the first step. Tuesday's attack was the second. We shall doubtless have many more before snow flies.

Valuable Public Protection

Mr. Joseph Hartigan, who retired yesterday from the office of Commissioner of Weights and Measures, leaves a record of faithful and efficient service. It was his duty to prevent the thieveries of those meanest of crooks, the short-weighters and short-measurers, and where they could not be prevented to bring about prosecutions. He performed that duty well, and undoubtedly saved for the consumers of this city large sums of money which would otherwise have been extracted from their pockets to make illegitimate profits for unscrupulous dealers.

It is to be hoped that the suggestion which Mr. Hartigan leaves as a valedictory—that the scope of his bureau be enlarged and the ordinances and laws which it enforces be modernized—may be followed. There has been an unfortunate tendency in this state, shown by several attempts to devitalize the State Department of Weights and Measures, to underestimate the worth of this form of public service. Instead of being held down and hampered, such bureaus and departments, whether state or municipal, should be fostered and encouraged. There is a wide need for them. They protect particularly the very poor, who are forced to buy in small quantities, and so are especially likely to be victims of the short-weighters. At this time consumers have difficulty in making their budgets supply their needs, at the best. Any governmental agency which helps to prevent their being cheated is worthy of all possible encouragement.

A State Food Commission Needed

Governor Whitman's message calling for the creation of a State Food Commission is sane and logical. Such a body as he asks the Legislature to create is necessary to supplement the work of the Federal Food Controller; and the work which the Governor has outlined for it is essentially supplementary, not that which would conflict with the duties and powers of Federal officials. The collecting of information about the state's food situation, the supervision and regulation of food storage, even the seizure and sale of foodstuffs within the state, are phases of food control where the state machinery may profitably meet, cog by cog, the Federal machinery.

Into the question of price fixing the Governor wisely decided not to venture. That is properly a Federal function. The state neither could nor should undertake to carry it out. Question will undoubtedly be raised when bills are before the Legislature for discussion as to the legality of seizure of foodstuffs and their distribution by the state in emergency, as the Governor's plan contemplates. That doubt may well be left to the future to resolve. There seems to be as good opinion in favor of the project as against it, to say the least; and certainly if the state does not assert drastic powers and exercise them there can be no hope for the public. The food interests, whether they be farmers' organizations or powerful middlemen and distributers, are able to protect themselves. The public has as its only weapon the boycott, and as it cannot boycott all foodstuffs that weapon is not especially powerful.

The consumers have to look to the state for relief from a system of food handling which is unwieldy, inefficient, wasteful and productive of improper profits on the one hand and grave hardships through overcharges on the other. The Legislature at the regular session declined to enact food legislation which had any teeth. Whether or not the bill which Mr. Perkins was responsible for was a statesmanlike creation when it went up to Albany, it was nothing but a farce when representatives of farmers' unions, middlemen, commission men and others who handle foodstuffs got through with it. Now a serious situation exists which must be met. Oldtime chatter about interfering with the laws of supply and demand, state meddling with business and the like cannot be permitted to prevent a proper and effective assumption of state authority over necessaries of life. Food in plenty for our soldiers and our workers and food for our allies unquestionably will be forthcoming at fair and reasonable prices under state and Federal control. Without such control there will be the possibility of a new crop of American "goulash barons" and almost the certainty of food riots in big cities.

The Legislature should not hesitate to carry out the Governor's recommendations.

Another Squeeze on Milk

(From The Cleveland Leader)

Milk goes up 20 per cent in Cleveland in the middle of a summer marked by extraordinarily favorable conditions for pastures. The cool, wet season, with a week or so of weather hot but still marked by many showers, has made the grass unusually luxuriant. The cheapest and most natural food for cows has been at its best, and still is exceptionally abundant.

The rise in the price of this vitally necessary food for little children has been 50 per cent in the last two years, at summer rates. Milk has gone up 100 per cent in a comparatively short period. And where is the top limit to be reached?

If the cost of milk is to rise two cents a quart, in the midst of exceedingly favorable summer conditions for pasturage, what may happen when nature is less friendly? Has the movement for lowering the cost of living any bearing whatever on one of the food staples which must be had in millions of homes where there are babies?

Possibly city and village people who have little yards may yet be driven to the humble but handy goat as a means of escape from the price of cow's milk. It takes little care to keep a goat and less space. Goats give excellent milk and they are accommodating in respect to diet.

Impartial Nightsticks

(From The Springfield Republican)

In one particular we can find encouragement in the Chester (Penn.) race riots, as compared with those in East St. Louis. The authorities in Chester were far more prompt and vigorous in repressing disorder, and they evidently did not commit the malignant offence of taking sides in the use of their clubs. Any rioter was knocked out, regardless of the color of his skin. It was a solid pleasure to read that "dozens of white men were knocked unconscious with riot sticks." The white gangsters and toughs will always run to excesses the more quickly if they have the slightest reason to think that the police will show partiality. White mobs must be put down with prompt severity wherever race friction arises, if trouble of this sort is to be minimized as it can be and must be.

Hoover and the Housewives

Some Comments on a Recent Address to the American People

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Of course you know the story of the two knights who fought over the two sides of the shield. There are two sides to every picture, as to every theory.

Is it not about time the American people turned to the other side of all this continual controversy over the so-called food conservation and looked at it with the common sense eyes of true patriotism?

The more it is discussed the less we have to eat, and the little we have costs us more as days, weeks and months go by in semi-starvation to the multitude of people—the truest, best Americans who ever lived—descendants of patriots whose dust reposes in the cemeteries and on the battlefields of the American Revolution, the Mexican and the Civil wars.

Now, in the message of the Food Administrator to the American people (which we read in The Tribune of yesterday—Sunday, July 29) we are told to ". . . eat cottonseed bread" (cow food), so as to save all the wheat for the Allies. It is all well enough to help feed the Allies and to support our own army, but how are we to "do our bit" when starved out ourselves?

How can we eat cereals with neither cream, milk or sugar, oatmeal—about as heavy and indigestible in hot weather as putty—buckwheat cakes without butter, and vegetables unseasoned with either butter, cream or fats of any kind (as the "beasts of the field" eat them)? We can eat raw salads (some of them), but it takes eggs, cream, acids and olive oil to make them palatable. We are told that "fruits and vegetables are plentiful—abundant." True, but with the high priced vegetables and fruits—peaches and pears two for 5 cents, or three for 10 cents; plums and apricots 1 cent apiece; bananas, 2 cents each, and all other fruits equally expensive—how are we to get them?

Mr. Hoover says: "Eat less meat, once a day." How many thousands of people have any sort of meat more than once a week (or have had for a long time), and never dream of having such luxuries—it amounts to that—as "fish, cheese, milk, eggs, poultry and game," as the Administrator permits us to have. Let him go from house to house and see.

He advises the use of "vegetable fats and vegetable oils in cooking." Oils from nuts and olives are more expensive even than butter, cream and other animal fats.

We can "eat ox tails." Yes; they are really a delicacy and very nutritious when young and tender, but if otherwise one might just as well try to eat a rawhide riding crop! They, too, are expensive, and, like the proverbial hare, first catch your ox!

Again, we are advised to save sugar by using "honey, molasses and syrups." Honey is always an expensive delicacy, and where, in the name of every stalk of sugar cane, is the molasses and syrup to come from if the thousands of tons and tons of sugar required to preserve millions of cans of fruit expected is made?

"Don't waste a drop of milk!" he adds. Too many of us (Oh, God!) haven't a drop to drink, and can't get it, at from 12 cents to 16 cents a quart, according to grade.

What? We must also "make our own soap!" It takes much fat, alkali and fuel to boil them to the consistency of soap. Ask the Food Administrator to make a pot or caldron of it. He'll find it a more difficult job than leisurely discussing the food question and hanging house cards in windows where there is little or nothing in the kitchen to eat and never a crumb or drop to waste!

Mr. Hoover estimates that the American women will preserve 200,000,000 jars and cans of fruit and vegetables this year, to supplement the 1,700,000,000 cans to be the output of our American canners. They have been doing that sort of thing to a great extent since their great-great-great-grandmothers died, and preserved everything in vegetables and fruits they could lay their hands on many scores of years before modern canneries were ever dreamed of. But they can't do the work and live on cottonseed bread, with neither butter, milk nor meat.

Ask him and the patriots who have to wear tags to try it, and see if they don't get too weak and sick to fight or to help those who are fighting now and those going out to fight?

One is constrained to think there is a great deal of mock patriotism going round in the guise of oldtime hand-to-hand and heart-to-heart Americanism. It will be a travesty for future generations to read in history, beside the really heroic records of our heroes and their loyal women.

We have endured and suffered and striven on—waiting and hoping for some relief, but as none comes in this recent "message" it *be-hoovers* us still to suffer and strive on, hoping and praying to survive and "win the victory!" JENNIE PORTER PARDEE.

New York, July 30, 1917.

Prohibition as a War Measure

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The United States Senate seems to be bent upon prohibition legislation, not in the interest of the people as a whole, and certainly not in the interest of the public revenue, but to please a fanatical minority, drunk with the love of rule and regardless of any one's freedom except their own.

Neither our allies nor our enemies, even after three years of terrific war, would dream of enacting any such unpopular and unnecessary legislation. For us to perpetrate such foolishness, at this time, as a "war measure," before we have actually begun to fight, would not only make us ridiculous in the eyes of the whole world, but, far worse, it would surely arouse widespread feelings of resentment and indignation among many millions of our loyal people, both native and foreign born.

To force prohibition legislation at this time, when a united nation is of all things most desirable, is to court disaster.

New York, July 31, 1917. W. C. C.

Fish Too Costly

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Apropos of Mr. Hoover's advice to eat lots of fish, the following experience may throw some light on why we continue to eat meat.

I stopped at a fish market in the vicinity of 181st Street and asked for a sea bass large enough for a family of four. The price was just one dollar, and I carried the fish home myself. I don't know how much it weighed, but I judge about three pounds, as there was only enough for dinner.

Now, the finest cut of porterhouse steak delivered at my house costs me about $1.50, and this is enough for two dinners. Spring lamb chops for dinner cost eighty cents. A leg of spring lamb, costing about $2, lasts for three meals. One dollar will buy a spring broiler.

That is why Mr. Hoover's suggestion falls on deaf ears in my family. C. P. E.

Spuyten Duyvil, N. Y., July 31, 1917.

What We Fight For?

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Does not the following tetralogical slogan sum up succinctly what we and our allies are fighting for?

"Fewer, but better, Germans."

H. D. BRANDYCE.

New York, July 31, 1917.

The Principal Factor of National Strength

By Charles Ferguson

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In spite of the country's admirable energy, intelligence and devotion now centring in the Defence Council and its Advisory Board, we are in danger of disappointment and disaster through failure to mark the difference between money power and tool power.

We must bear in mind that money power is a merely conventional institution, while tool power measures the strength of the nation and will decide the issue of the war.

The point is that the kind of economic power that rests merely upon legality and property right, should be kept quite distinct in thought from the kind of economic power that actually works and fights. For legal economic power has no direct relation to natural forces. It merely gives its possessors rights in court against society at large. It can be used quite as effectively to waste real economic power as to conserve and increase it.

The financial system of the country is, broadly speaking, the organization of ownership of legal economic power. We are living under an historical tradition which falsely assumes that this organized ownership tends necessarily—under the guidance of enlightened self-interest and natural economic law—to produce the maximum tool power that the country is capable of, in the present state of the arts.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The fact is that organized ownership devoid of social and scientific guidance tends constantly toward self-destruction and the wreck of economic society. Its instinctive and suicidal effort is to lay upon the general working plant a heavier overhead charge than can be physically sustained. Because it erroneously supposes that legal claims are identical with capital, it wastes capital in the accumulation of claims.

Now, real economic power is, of course, compounded of skill and tools. To enhance our working and fighting strength we must improve our technical ability and our material equipment—our capital. The short formula of the martial law of production is this: Legal economic power must not be permitted to exert itself otherwise than for the increase of real economic power.

This primary law of modern war cannot be executed by soldiers or policemen. It must be executed by masters of efficient industry and of creative arts. Organized ownership must—for its own good and the validation of its securities, as well as for the common defence—be subjected to organized tool power.

Since it is impossible to accomplish this social recuperation by authority of the police or by any external governmental pressure, the process must be conceived of as a regeneration of democracy, to be accomplished freely and unofficially by an influential minority in local communities.

Compulsion cannot produce the valid type; but once born in freedom that type will conquer all other types by main strength.

It will be found that there is an intrinsic power in sound economics to drive unsound economics out of business. It will be found that organized productive ability is stronger than organized ownership and is the natural conserver and protector of all legitimate property rights.

The authority of the entrepreneur and the engineer—of the masters of tools and materials—will establish itself wherever investors first awaken to their own best interests, and it will diffuse itself throughout the country by its inherent strength.

All this amounts simply to saying that the war exigency requires that the principle of the Priority Board shall be applied to the production of goods, as well as to their distribution. If there is need of a social authority to decide what uses the commodities that happen to be in existence shall be put to, much more is there need of a social authority, sitting at the sources of credit and capital, to decide what goods shall be produced. For to leave the direction of enterprises to the rule of egotism is not merely to waste goods, but to waste also the creative power of the nation. It paralyzes the life centres of the economic body—congests the brain with fever and leaves the feet and hands frost-bitten. By committing the control of tools to idlers and wastrels, it diminishes the purchasing power of a day's work, and inhibits the production of food and clothes.

Only those who are intellectually incompetent in economic matters can fail to perceive this truth. And, having once perceived it, one cannot disregard it in one's personal conduct without becoming accessory to a national failure and humiliation.

As to what to do, it should be admitted at once that men are not moved in mass by force of intellect. The huge imposture of our actual politics rests upon the false notion that men are so moved; the people are led astray by their instincts and their short-run interests under cover of flattering appeals made to their philosophy.

The new age should introduce a sincerer politics, proceeding by demonstration of power and service, rather than by argument, and resting frankly upon the right of the engineer to run the engine. Thus the new politics will be cautious in words and bold in deeds. It will understand that the right way to prove the principle of the tool power bank is to speak softly and produce one—for example, for the underwriting of farmers and the increase of the food supply.

New York, July 31, 1917.

Conscientious Objectors

An Answer to the Criticisms of Bishop Cooke

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The article by Bishop Cooke, reprinted in The Tribune from "The Methodist Advocate-Journal," brings up an important subject—that of the conscientious objector.

The Bishop takes an impregnable stand when he declares repeatedly, "Certainly no man has the right to disobey God. Certainly no government has the right to compel a man to do a wrong thing." He might also add that the judge of the man's relation to God can of course be only the man himself.

The writer misunderstands the conscientious objector, however, in the statement, "He will not die for any of these principles, nor will he suffer one hour of agony, nor endure a pin prick." Over 4,000 of these men have been imprisoned in England, some for the third or fourth time, for refusal to aid in war. Thirty of them were taken to France and there condemned to death, the sentence being afterward commuted to ten years' penal servitude because of Parliamentary protests. Are there no hours of agony here?

Bishop Cooke's chief point is his charge that the C. O. "will not go to war, but is willing to enjoy the results of war." Here he is wrong. The objectors have no desire to enjoy the results of war, for these results, in their opinion, are only and essentially evil.

The Bishop further recommends that they be punished neither by interning nor imprisonment, but by being "deprived forever of all benefits of war, of all political and social and civil rights."

The fruits of war, according to the pacifist, are taxation, high prices, repression, the checking of civilization, the ill-will of our neighbors, and insecurity by land and sea. The conscientious objectors are sharing these with their countrymen. As to our political and social and civil rights, however, these we owe to no international conflict, but to the objectors of past generations, to the rebels of Runnymede, to Pym and Hampden, to Latimer and Ridley, and to the Pilgrim Fathers upon whose monument Wendell Phillips would have written, "The Right is more than our country."

JESSIE WALLACE HUGHAN (Ph. D.).

Doylestown, Penn., July 31, 1917.

On the Ruins of the Altes Schloss

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Anxious to play the part of a royal Jeremiah, the last of the Hohenzollerns may, in his vanity, be tempted to try his writer's talent by composing, in the style of the Nibelungenlied, a Book of Lamentations on the Decline and Fall of Royalty from 1888 to 1918:

"How do the royal palaces solitary lie, they that were so full of splendor? Our queens became as widows and we ourselves tributary of the people. We and our children weep sore in the night, and our tears are on our cheeks. Among all of our former friends we have none to comfort us. They all dealt treacherously with us. They have become our enemies. All of our persecutors overtook us within the straits. The ways of Tsarskoe-Selo, Potsdam and Schoenbrunn do mourn, because none come to the former seats of royal glory. Our adversaries have become the head. For Jehovah hath afflicted us for the multitude of our transgressions. All our majesty is departed and the multitudes of Russian granddukes, Austrian archdukes and Prussian princes are become like harts that find no pasture. They are gone without strength before the pursuer."

The recent abdication rumor itself may have been a mere journalistic hoax, but the underlying thought was rooted in deep psychological insight. President Wilson, setting his Yankee jaws, said one day to Huerta: "Go you must"—and the Mexican usurper went, and died in an American prison. William is no fool. He knows that our President and Lloyd George, Ribot and Kerensky have the same lovable intentions toward him, and he knows that sooner or later go he will.

Even if the Allies, weakened by Russia's defection, unable to wait for Uncle Sam's entering the fray in full force, were obliged to-morrow to conclude a "German peace," a new unpleasant world would be faced by William: no court in Petrograd, those of St. James's, Brussels, Rome, Bucharest and Belgrade closed forever.

New York, July 26, 1917. S.

No Stigma in Conscription

A Dearth of National Fidelity if Volunteers Were Only Patriots

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I wish to vouch for the correctness of facts and the sincerity of spirit shown in a short note in to-day's Tribune upholding conscription. Its writer, Samuel Hagan, I recognize as a recent acquaintance and have some familiarity with the heckling he is receiving from some critics with stinted ideas. It is the height of folly and injustice for any one to imply that with conscription there goes a blemish. If volunteers are the only patriots, then there is a sad dearth of national fidelity and service in this deserving land.

The safety and sanity of conscription are obvious. All the citizens of the country cannot volunteer because of the obligating nature of their home and business life. But the draft is like a wand. First ascertaining that a man is fit and convinced of the need for his help (though submissive to the selecting process), when it touches him all changes like magic and he is released from important home ties without the feeling of shirking and neglecting very necessary relations. When a man is drafted there can be no reproach or complaint from those at home, for then truly is he answering his country's call. Such a regulation solves admirably the problem of the married man. So does it answer the problem for millions of others who have sound personal objections and inconveniences that deter them from voluntary enlistment.

I hope Mr. Hagan and others will not be discomfited by any ignorant remarks concerning their waiting to be called. Take it from whence it comes. The volunteer system has not a leg to stand on anywhere on the globe. National service must be accomplished in a national way—conscription. After this war, when a peace league of nations has been formed, we can look for service on a larger scale. If this new service is to be strong we will not make it voluntary; of necessity it will be international conscription. Conscription lends a scientific aspect to the quality and quantity of the fighting forces of nations. It does away with wanton human waste, and is therefore an invaluable principle.

THEODORE MICHEL.

Brooklyn, July 30, 1917.

The German-Language Press

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I most heartily commend your exposition of the treasonable publications in the German-language press.

I believe you represent the majority of citizens of our descent, but unfortunately not all, and besides there are so many German non-citizens here, very many of whom, as far as they dare, are opposed to our success.

It seems to me that all enemy-language papers should be suppressed; it would be quite proper as a war measure and help people to realize we are at war. Of course, they would set up a terrible wail; but let them publish in English, so they may continue to make a living for their editors—which I imagine is the most important thing to them—as long as they behave. If they still continue treasonable, fine or suppress them altogether. In Germany, which they so much admire, they would have scant consideration if they offended as here.

Unfortunately, some of our American papers either wilfully or through ignorance or error publish most deplorable editorials, which should come in for notice by the government. FRANCIS DEAN.

New York, July 30, 1917.

Aiding the Enemy

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Some of our writers tell us we are "aiding the enemy's diplomacy." It appears to be true, for the following reasons:

As long as the German government can convince the people that they are waging a defensive war it will have the sacrificial support of that people. As soon as the people begin to see that they have been duped and that the war is not one of defence, it seems likely that they will revolt against that government.

Every statement by our leaders and in our press to the effect that we are in the war to crush Germany and to discriminate after the war against German trade is of inestimable help to the German militarists. It gives color to their propaganda that they are fighting to defend themselves. It welds the people more firmly to them.

SYDNEY THOMPSON.

Norfolk, Conn., July 28, 1917.

Bishop Potter and Suffrage

Proofs Produced That He Favored Votes for Women

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Several weeks ago, when The Tribune published a letter from W. G. Appleton, of Dobb's Ferry, saying he was willing to make a sworn statement that Bishop Henry Codman Potter was opposed to woman suffrage, I began to make an investigation. This has proved to be very difficult, as the Bishop died nine years ago, and many of his contemporaries have passed away. The suffrage petition to the New York Constitutional Convention of 1894, which he is said to have signed, was kept at Cherry's, in charge of a number of well known women. Of these Mrs. Josephine Shaw Lowell, Dr. Mary Putnam Jacobi and Mrs. Henry M. Sanders have died; another is ill to be consulted and one or two others cannot be located. The petition itself was sent to the convention, and nobody knows what became of it.

Miss Susan B. Anthony, who knew Bishop Potter, often spoke with pride of his being in favor of woman suffrage. In her biography, which was published in 1898, the statement was made that he signed this petition. It was repeated in "The History of Woman Suffrage," published in 1902, and it never was denied by the Bishop or any of his friends.

The National Suffrage Association has published for the last ten or fifteen years a leaflet of "Eminent Opinions," containing this quotation from Bishop Potter: "It is grotesque to claim that a great many women are not better trained and more intelligent for the use of the ballot than millions of men; especially women who own property should have a voice in the affairs of the community and the laws which affect property." Thousands of these have been circulated, and this quotation never was called into question, but the most careful search has failed to discover from what speech or writing it was taken, although great care always is exercised to have such quotations authoritative.

Bishop Potter was connected with the Church Association for the Advancement of the Interests of Labor from its organization in 1887, part of the time as its president. Miss Harriet A. Keyser was then its secretary, and is still with it. She was surprised to be asked if he was in favor of woman suffrage and said that she never had doubted it, and was positive that he believed working women especially should have a vote.

In a volume written by Miss Keyser called "Bishop Potter, the People's Friend," she quotes from an address which he made to the women graduates of Packer Institute, Brooklyn, in June, 1877, taking Deborah the Prophetess as his text. On page 6, after referring to the innate love of home life by women, is this sentence: "It is not wonderful, in view of these facts, that when any woman, or set of women, undertakes to break out of the restraints of home to proclaim a larger liberty for her sex, or demand what are called Woman's Rights, there should be on the part of a vast majority of that sex a decided disapproval of their course. . . . But is there not something to be said on the other side, and is it not time that it was said? . . . Do not be afraid, then, to lift your voice in any good cause that aims to elevate women to equal chance and equal respect and equal emolument with men in the great struggle of life."

Miss Keyser, who was an organizer for the State Suffrage Association, in a report to this convention in 1893, quoting the ministers who were in favor of woman suffrage, gave Bishop Potter as one of them. This was at the time when she was constantly working with him in the above-named church organization, and her statement never was questioned.

Mrs. William H. Hyde, daughter of Bishop Potter, writes me that, while she has no written words on the subject, she feels perfectly sure from what she knew of him and his views on public questions that he was unquestionably friendly to the cause of woman suffrage, and that her husband shares in this opinion. Mrs. Edwin Tatham, another daughter, writes: "I have always taken it for granted, and, indeed, all recollections of talks with my father have led me to believe, that he was for woman suffrage, just as he was for all progressive and vital things."

Miss Virginia Potter, a niece of the Bishop, writes: "At the time Mrs. Lowell's petition was being signed there was an infinite amount of talk and interest in the whole suffrage question, and I remember of nothing then or later to make me doubt my uncle's sympathetic attitude toward suffrage for women." Other friends and relatives of the Bishop have expressed similar opinions. Mrs. June Potter Russell, a daughter, who is a very strong anti-suffragist, makes in The Tribune the simple assertion, "My father was not in favor of extending the suffrage to women."

It does not seem necessary to continue investigation along this line. The suffragists always regarded Bishop Potter as an advocate of their cause, and are greatly surprised to have his position questioned, for the first time, nine years after his death.

IDA HUSTED HARPER.

New York, July 28, 1917.

Night Signs for Streetcars

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: There is one thing the Public Service Commission might get for us that would be appreciated by all who have occasion to use the streetcars at night. This apparently simple convenience is the designation of the different surface lines by colored lights high up on the ends of the car roofs, where all could see. The transparent names would still be there for the uninitiated, but the habitual users would quickly learn to determine by a glance from afar whether the car headed toward them was their own or another.

It is very difficult at night in the busy downtown district to make out the name of our car until it is almost upon us, and sometimes we signal the wrong one and get things said at us by an exasperated motorman. Now that colored electric bulbs are common, it would seem an easy matter to mark certain lines with a single light of red, green or blue, or with two of the same or differing colors, or with three in a vertical or a horizontal line, or in a triangle. If the identifying end lights were repeated above the sides of the cars, it would certainly facilitate their loading at congested crossings and save the busy conductor from the usual fusillade of questions. ALICE C. RUSSELL.

New York, July 31, 1917.

Westerners at War

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: It was with a feeling of gratitude that I read in this morning's Tribune the timely article of Felix Orman on "How the West Reacts to War."

Being a Westerner of the Far West—Colorado (Mr. Orman gets no further West than Kansas)—I can but indorse and emphasize the truths of his statements.

The West in general, and Colorado in particular, is just as busy to-day with Red Cross work, service leagues, conscriptions and drills in proportion as the East. She is giving freely of her wealth and offering up on the altar of war her brawny sons without ostentation, "fuss or feather." Thanks!

LILLIAN S. GREIG.

New York, July 30, 1917.